## From the Editor

WHEN some 200 Army officers became the unknowing victims of identity theft, e-commerce took on a much different look. CID author Sandy Goss lists steps victims should take, as well as measures available to lessen the likelihood of being victimized in the first place.

SSG John Valceanu presents the emerging face of military operations in urban terrain in this month's cover story. Meantime, Steve Harding travels to Italy for a joint U.S.-Italian noncombatant evacuation operation, and also covers the activation of the famed 173rd Airborne Brigade — the first major Army unit to serve in Vietnam.

Former Soldiers staff member MSG Larry Lane takes us along on an Army force-onforce training exercise using German farms and small towns as the backdrop — the first such venture in more than a decade.

And with the world's attention focused on the 2000 Olympics in Sydney, Army athletes are helping to carry the U.S. flag "down under" — we offer a special preview by Soldiers' summer intern, Sarah McCov.

Ray Historitation

#### **More on Uniforms**

I ENJOYED the article on the history of the U.S. Army uniform in your July issue. I believe, however, there was an error with regard to trouser striping. The trouser striping authorized in 1832 was in the branch color (Infantry-white: Artillery-scarlet; and Dragoons - yellow) for the combat arms. What happened in 1851 was that the branch colors were changed for the Infantry (from white to blue), Dragoons (yellow to orange), and Regiment of Mounted Riflemen (black piped gold to green).

William T. Barrante Watertown, Conn.

NOT to be picky, but shouldn't we be? In July's "Uniform Traditions" poster, the Medical Corps major is wearing the ribbon to her Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal upside down. The center stripes are "bluewhite-red" on the medal's suspension ribbon; hers appears as "red-white-blue." As a former OBC platoon trainer, I used to love catching my prior-service lieutenants on this one! I hope the chemical officer's ribbon is being worn correctly - his picture is a little too grainy for me to verify. He probably remembers me as a TAC officer. And before the complaints roll in, ves, I have better things to do! MAJ David Molaison

MAJ David Molaison Fort Lewis, Wash.

THANK you for the correction. Another reader also reminded that the AFEM is one of three medals in current use that cannot be reversed and still be worn correctly, the other two being the Army of Occupation Medal and the new Kosovo Campaign Medal (see article in July "Briefings"). Also, the AFEM is correctly displayed on the poster insert to this year's

# **Wearing Army Traditions**

ALTHOUGH I really enjoyed your July article on the history of Army uniforms, you didn't make me like today's uniforms any better. I still have to agree with the recent article in the Army Times that discussed how many soldiers do not like their current uniforms,

but prefer the older khaki's, and Pinks

and Greens. Interesting how, on the last page of the Army Times article, all of the uniforms shown were of the khaki or light OD green/khaki color. Now those were classy uniforms!

It was a nice try to convince me that the Class A's could not be matched in 1832 because generals couldn't afford to find a match of coat and trousers (at their pay grade, they couldn't afford a bolt of cloth big enough to make their whole uniform?). Personally, I liked the story I heard about the Cavalry. Their jackets did not fade because they rolled them up and sat on them as they rode, so their pants faded in the sun, but their jackets did not. Now, that was more romantic then not being able to match a bolt of cloth!

I wish I were on a board selecting the future Class A's because today's uniforms have lost their class! Let's go back to khaki!

LTC Jeanette McMahon via e-mail

edition of **The Soldiers Almanac**.

### **Challenging Claim**

THE back cover of the July Soldiers states the 54th Massachusetts was the first black unit to engage in battle. That is incorrect. On July 16, 1863, the 1st Kansas Colored Infantry was a part of the Union forces engaging Confederates at Honey Springs in Indian Territory (Oklahoma). That unit is credited with firing a volley into the center of a Confederate charge that more or less broke up the Confederate forces. The Confederates were superior in numbers (nearly two to one), but were not very well disciplined and after the volley fire that broke the center, left the field of battle. Nothing against the 54th, the movie about them got me interested in the Civil War again, but we need to ensure credit is given where due. Although the war in the west was very remote, events also occurred here and they should not be overlooked. SSG James E. Williams, USAR

James E. Williams, USAR University of Oklahoma via e-mail

### **Black Beaches**

THE two-page spread in the July issue is terrific and does a great job of promoting one of the service's great recreation facilities and Hawaii. However, the caption for the picture on the left side of page 46 is misleading if people are not famil-

iar with the Island of Hawaii, KMC, and the location of the nearest beaches. The caption says "sea turtles can often be seen on the black sand beaches near KMC." Well, there are no black sand beaches in the near vicinity of KMC. You would have to drive miles down to the vicinity of Hilo (east side) or Kona (west side) to go to any black sand beaches.

Keep up the great work in presenting the historical and current Army to your subscribers. I thoroughly enjoyed the recent issues with information on the Korean War. I have shared them with friends who are veterans of that era.

LTC Michael F. Tanigawa (Ret.) via e-mail

## **Safety Violation**

I WANT to bring to your attention something I noticed in your July issue: the photo of the vehicle in tow on page 36 displays a safety violation. The hook on the tow chain should be pointed up, rather than down, so that if it breaks it will fall down rather than shoot upward. I ask that you forward this message to the appropriate authority so that a correction can be made. Perhaps this will save a soldier from getting injured — or worse.

CSM Albert D. Newton Fort Stewart, Ga.

YOUR magazine is a great way to see what the rest of the forces are doing. The only thing I have a problem with is when we show soldiers the wrong way to do things. In your July issue, Sharp Shooters, page 36, you show a photograph of 88M soldiers training on recovery operations with the instructor. There are three things wrong: the main winch line hook is upside down, the soldier on the right is not wearing gloves and the chain is

wrapped around the tie-down loops. We stress safety in the Army but do we train safety? It does no good to train soldiers without stressing proper safety procedures. Recovery operations are one of the most dangerous peacetime procedures we do.

CW2 Joseph Deblois Camp Bondsteel, Kosovo

WE couldn't agree more about the importance of safety; however, **Soldiers** staff members are not safety specialists. We have to trust the photographers and, more importantly, the people in the photos, to do the right things.

#### **Uniform of the Future?**

AS a career infantryman, I'm as interested in technological developments as the next guy. But what I've noticed about combat arms soldiers is that they do things on their own to make the uniform more mission-friendly. If they need an extra pocket for maps, etc., they'll add one somewhere. If a certain piece of gear is too heavy, it gets left behind.

So I am disturbed, and embarrassed, to see your June article featuring skin-tight black jumpsuits (with no pockets at all no less!), fully enclosed helmets, etc., being advertised as the future of the Army. Whoever is designing this stuff clearly doesn't spend much time "humpin' a ruck" out in the field!

I believe the BDU is about as perfect a combat uniform as we're going to get. Let's focus on the person inside the uniform. I for one would certainly rather see the money spent on real-world improvements for our people — getting every soldier EIB-qualified, for example, or on designing a new, lighter field shelter system.

SGT G. E. Whitley via e-mail

## **Artillery Adjustment**

AS an artilleryman, I was curious when I read MAJ John Dacey's letter in your July Feedback about the soldier standing directly behind the recoiling cannon tube on the back cover of the May issue. I grabbed the issue and noticed that the soldier is actually standing to the

right of the cannon tube and is not in harm's way; however, the soldier is on the wrong side of the howitzer.

> SGT Adam M. Durand New Orleans, La.

### **Changing Uniform**

I HAVE been reading your magazine for some time, since I am considering joining the Army later this year. I congratulate you for all the useful information I have been getting from **Soldiers**.

I am currently finishing my four-year tour in the Navy and, with all the information you have provided me, I now know it is worth becoming a soldier.

GM3 Giovannie G.Ortiz San Juan, P.R.

Soldiers is for soldiers and DA civilians. We invite readers' views. Stay under 150 words — a post card will do — and include your name, rank and address. We'll withhold your name if you desire and may condense your views because of space. We can't publish or answer every one, but we'll use representative views. Write to: Feedback, Soldiers, 9325 Gunston Road, Ste. S108, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5581, or e-mail: soldiers@belvoir.army.mil.

United States Government	Credit card orders are welcome!	ars
INFORMATION	Fax your orders (202) 512-2250	510
Order Processing Code:	Phone your orders (202) 512-1800	22
* 5905		1
YES, please send subscriptions to:		30.00
Soldiers	(SOL) at \$28 each (\$35.00 foreign) per year.	THE RES
The total cost of my order is \$	Price includes regular shipping & handling and is subject to change.	
	Check method of payment:	o Didji
Name or title (Please type or print)	Check payable to: Superintendent of Documents	
Company name Room, floor, suite	GPO Deposit Account	
Street address		27
	☐ VISA ☐ MasterCard ☐ Discover →	
City State Zip code+4		itel 3
	SON SON	2.80
Daytime phone including area code	(expiration date)	
Purchase order number (optional)		9 3.
	Authorizing signature 11/99 371954, Pittsburgh PA 15250-7954	

September 2000 3